UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,940	03/30/2001	Robert Martin	0102374-00015	7591

21125	7590	04/07/2006

NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST
155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD
BOSTON, MA 02210-2604

EXAMINER
PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/823,940	MARTIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 January 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,24-28,32-38 and 40* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,24-28,32-38 and 40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 January 2006</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/14/2005</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-11, 24-28, 32-38 and 40 are subject to examination. Claims 12-23, 29-31 and

39 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 1/20/2006, pages 7-21, have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-11, 24-28, 32-38 and 40 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "the copending application 09/823,938 (notice of allowance mailed

August 2, 2005) contain claims that are having addition features, such as message fragments and

a message handling object, are not found in the pending claims of the application, hence, the

double patenting rejection be withdrawn".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The double

patenting rejction, dated 10/20/2005, with the copending application 09/823,938 is relied upon

for the limitations that are present in the claims of this application (please see below double

patenting section in this office action). Whether the copending application contains additional

features compared to the current applicaion claims is immaterial, as the below mentioned double

patenting section provides proper reasioning for the double patenting rejection, and do not

overcome the double patenting rejection. Hence, the double patenting rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2), "the cited art Eastep et al. 6,731,625, MCI (Hereinafter Eastep-

MCI) does not disclose any of the claimed steps and the limitations of claim 1, i.e., generating a

compiled representation of a textual description in a markup language of operations of

performing a call feature or service", "instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled

representation", "instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation",

"instantiating a context object that maintains information regarding a present state of the call

feature or service, and that signals the feature object in regard to events occurring with respect to

the call feature or service, and the feature object responding to said signaling by effecting

execution of one or more of the operations in the compiled representation of the textual

description in the mark-up language", and limitations of claim 24, "as applicant is unable to see

the novel feature compiled representation, novel feature textual description, etc of the claims in

the cited reference teaching and the cited passages have little substantive relevance to the

claimed invention".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to

applicant's arguments against the references individually (Eastep- MCI), one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re

Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The above claimed limitations of

claims 1 and 24 are rejected by the combined teachings of three references, i.e., Eastep et al.

6,731,625, MCI (Hereinafter Eastep-MCI), Smith II, Julius, 6772,139 (Hereinafter Smith-Julius),

Giordano, III et al, Cisco Technology, 6,370,141 (Hereinafter Giordano-Cisco) and Bowman-

Amuah, 2003/0058277 (Hereinafter Bowman). Contrary to applicant's assertions, the above

limitations, i.e., the usage of compiled representation, textual description are well-known in the

art.

The Eastep-MCI reference discloses the well-known limitations not just once but several

times at several places. For example, the Eastep-MCI reference discloses usage of the compiled

representation (e.g., figure 6, contain Receive Network Events component that parses the events

and sends them to Process Events 402 and /or figure 7 contain Process Topology 406 of parses

topology and configuration data, stores them and sends them to Process Events 402, and / or

figure 3, having a system and method for providing enhanced SS7 network management

functions that are provided by a distributed client/server platform that can receive and process

events that are generated by various SS7 network elements, which are parsed and standardized to

allow for the processing of events generated by any type of element, and/or figures showing

network topology databases, transmission network management systems, network maintenance

schedules and systems that support representation that is assembled and/or accumulated and/or

collected and/or gathered, and/or figure 5 containing SNMS components that are used for parsing

specific rules used for parsing and analysis rules to be used by SNMS, and/or standardized

SNMS events related representation, and/or figures 55A and 55B containing the usage of the

pager termination processor and configuration file related to pager related representation).

The Eastep-MCI reference also discloses usage of the textual description (e.g., figure 81

containing a corporate web server with related records for the web pages in the call center server

and/or HTML information used with the corporate web server and/or MIME file containing

information related to the directory server 12012, and/or figure 100 containing VOMessage

40420 object with associated textual description).

Further, the specification of this application, very clearly states, "the compiled

representation is implemented in an object-oriented environment, e.g., a C++ object

environment", col., 5, lines 6 - 15, " the textual description embodying the operations is parsed to

generate the compiled representation", "textual description that embodies the operations can be

provided, e.g., by a mark-up language such as, XML, DTD, etc", col., 5, lines 6 – 15 and it is

well-known in the art that the compiled representation also meaning assembled representation

and/or accumulated representation and/or collected representation and/or gathered

representation. In the absence of the applicant approaching, the examiner, before the remarks

dated 1/20/2006 (for which this office action is issued), for any necessary clarification for any

limitations rejected in the previous office action, dated 10/20/2005, (note: the examiner aided the

applicant each time the applicant needed any type of clarification (map teachings and/or

explanation of examiner's interpretation of the limitations in the cited references) and the

examiner addressed all issues to the applicant for the prosecution of this case during the several

interviews related to this application, In fact, in one instance the examiner withdrawn the final

office action, mailed dated 7/20/2004, which the examiner prepared, dated 6/24/2004, prior to

the interview dated 6/29/2004, to accommodate applicant's additional extensive amendments to

the claimed subject matter after the interview), and considering the applicant claimed limitations

that reads upon several instances / teachings of the cited reference the limitations are properly

taught by the Eastep-MCI reference.

The specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled in the art will, of

course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of the invention and that

modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the invention. By way of

non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML and so

forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further

example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may be implemented with

programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly

claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject

matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant states (3), "If the examiner did not disagree with applicant's summary, the

examiner should have pointed out the inaccuracies in the next Office letter, hence, the applicant's

considers the initial summary as accurate statement of the substance of the interview".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments.

Please note that in the previous office action, dated 10/20/2005, the examiner claified

regarding this matter as follow:

"Dodrill, 6,490,564 does not teach or suggest some of the claimed limitations of claim

32, as agreed upon during the interview of June 29, 2004". The examiner respectfully disagrees

in response to applicant's arguments. For clarification, on June 29, 2004, the examiner called the

attorney (Mr. David Powaner) to inquire about the latest submitted amended claims. The

attorney indicated that the amendment submitted on 6/29/2004 are the latest submitted amended

claims", see interview summary, dated June 29, 2004. Since, no discussion happened regarding

the subject matter of any claims of the application, no subject matter of the claims was agreed

upon with the examiner.

Further, in any of the previous office action, the examiner has never agreed with the

contents of the applicant's summary of interview, dated 06/29/2004. When the applicant's

summary of interview was available to the examiner, the examiner pointed out the inaccuracies

of the contents of the applicant's summary of interview, dated 06/29/2004 in the previous office

action, which was a non-final office action (and not a final office action).

Since, the examiner has never agreed with the contents of the applicant's summary of

interview, dated 06/29/2004, and the examiner still believes in the inaccuracies of the contents of

the applicant's summary of interview, the above-mentioned clarification of the previous office

action, dated 10/20/2005, is proper.

Applicant states (4), "Dodrill fails to teach features of claim 32, i.e., instantiated object

that accessing the compiled representation to determine at least an action to be effected for

providing the call service, as this was agreed upon by the examiner in an interview conducted on

June 29, 2004 and summarized in a response filed by the applicant on the same day".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. As mentioned

above, the examiner never agreed with the contents of the applicant's summary of interview,

dated 06/29/2004. Further, the contents of the applicant's provided summary of interview, dated

06/29/2004, also does not support applicant's new assertions, that the Dodrill reference fails to

teach features of claim 32 as that it was agreed upon by the examiner in an interview, dated

1/20/2006.

In fact, on 6/20/2005, the applicant added the limitations, "instantiated object that

accessing the compiled representation to determine at least an action to be effected for providing

the call service" to the claim 32.   The applicant provided claim 32, dated June 29, 2004, even

after the interview, did not contain the limitations "instantiated object that accessing the

compiled representation to determine at least an action to be effected for providing the call

service", hence, the examiner is unable to concede that the examiner agreed with the applicant

that the Dodrill fails the limitations in an interview conducted on June 29, 2004. Therefore, the

rejection is maintained.

Applicant states (5), "Although Bowman-Amuah, 2003/0058277 (Hereinafter Bowman)

does discuss the use of objects, but it does not disclose relied upon limitations i.e., instantiating a

context object of the claim 32.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Bowman

discloses the well-known concept of instantiating a context object (e.g., paragraphs, 894, 243,

2790, 3128, 3342, 3800, 4595, 4593, 4602, 4490, 4582, 2790, 2005). Further, it is well known in

the art including the teachings of the Bowman reference that the instantiation would provide

information relating to the context object. This would help the execution to help perform the

operation mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up language. The operation

specified by the compiled representation of the mark-up language would help carry out a task

using the software for the device. Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states,

"those skilled in the art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and

example of the invention and that modifications can be made thereto without departing from the

scope of the invention. By way of non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup

languages other HTML, XML and so forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the

invention. By way of further example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may

be implemented with programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims

contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the

claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (6), "the cited art Danne et. al. 6,226,286 (Hereafter Danne), does not

disclose claimed limitations of claims 33-36, the use of a compiled representation of a call

feature of service that is described, textually, by a mark-up language" and "instantiated objects to

perform the services described therein".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The

limitations, "the use of a compiled representation of a call feature of service that is described,

textually, by a mark-up language", are rejected by combined teachings of Dodrill and Danne. In

response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re

Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "instantiated

objects to perform the services described therein", are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification

are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.

1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166

USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). What is claimed is, instantiating the context object in response to

a boundary event with respect to the call / telecommunications service or feature which is related

to the above arguments. Danne teaches instantiating the context object in response to a boundary

event with respect to the call / telecommunications service or feature (e.g., FIG. 6, col., 6, line 15

– col. 7, line 29, abstract). Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those

skilled in the art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of

the invention and that modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the

invention. By way of non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other

HTML, XML and so forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By

way of further example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may be

implemented with programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims

contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the

claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (7), "Dodrill fails to teach or suggest that the XML should be

compiled". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In

response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's

invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "the XML should be

compiled", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of

the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van

Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly

what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). What is claimed is,

"a compiled representation of a textual description in the mark-up language of operations for

performing a call feature or service". Dodrill clearly discloses a compiled representation (e.g.,

usage of generated XML, col., 7, line 8 – col., 9, line 65) of a textual description (e.g., document

information, col., 3, line 8 – col., 4, line 33) in the mark-up language (e.g., XML, col., 7, line 8 –

col., 9, line 65) of operations for performing a call feature or service (e.g., for voce enabled web

applications, col., 7, line 8 – col., 9, line 65). Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19,

clearly states, "those skilled in the art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is

merely and example of the invention and that modifications can be made thereto without

departing from the scope of the invention. By way of non-limiting example, it will be

appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML and so forth, as described above, may be

utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further example, it will be appreciated that the

methods and systems may be implemented with programming structures other than OOP

objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon

the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is

maintained.

Applicant argues (8), "Dodrill fails to teach or suggest object can access the compiled

representation, the feature context object". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to

applicant's arguments. Dodrill clearly discloses object can access the compiled representation

(e.g., usage of generated XML over the network by several hardware/software items, col., 7, line

8 – col., 9, line 65), the feature context object (e.g., objects for user interface logistics and tie

services, for forming a coherent application, generated new XML documents during runtime

which are utilized by server components, col., 9, line 1 – col., 10, line 19). Also, the

specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled in the art will, of course,

appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of the invention and that

modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the invention. By way of

non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML and so

forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further

example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may be implemented with programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (9), "the cited art Danne et. al. 6,226,286 (Hereafter Danne), does not disclose claimed limitations of claims 33-36, the use of a compiled representation of a call feature of service that is described, textually, by a mark-up language". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, "the use of a compiled representation of a call feature of service that is described, textually, by a mark-up language", are rejected by combined teachings of Dodrill and Danne. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Dodrill clearly discloses a compiled representation (e.g., usage of generated XML, col., 7, line 8 – col., 9, line 65) of a textual description (e.g., document information, col., 3, line 8 – col., 4, line 33) in the mark-up language (e.g., XML, col., 7, line 8 – col., 9, line 65) of operations for performing a call feature or service (e.g., for voce enabled web applications, col., 7, line 8 – col., 9, line 65). Danne teaches instantiating the context object in response to a boundary event with respect to the call / telecommunications service or feature (e.g., FIG. 6, col., 6, line 15 – col. 7, line 29, abstract), instantiating the context object in response to an event indicative of any of call origination or call termination (e.g., FIG. 6, col., 6, line 15 – col. 7, line 29, abstract), the textual description defines a set of rules and actions for providing the

telecommunication service (e.g., FIG. 6, col., 6, line 15 – col. 7, line 29, abstract), the textual description defines a call policy associated with a subscriber (e.g., FIG. 6, col., 6, line 15 – col. 7, line 29, abstract). The combined teachings of Dodrill and Danne disclose a method for telecommunications to process telephone call processing as per user request using the markup language. Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled in the art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of the invention and that modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the invention. By way of non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML and so forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further example, it wil1 be appreciated that the methods and systems may be implemented with programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (10), "the cited art Eastep et al. 6,731,625, MCI (Hereinafter Eastep-MCI) does not disclose claimed limitations of claim 24, and instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, "claimed limitations of claim 24, and instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation", are rejected by combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith II, Julius, 6772,139 (Hereinafter Smith-Julius) and Giordano, III et al, Cisco Technology, 6,370,141 (Hereinafter Giordano-Cisco). In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375

(Fed. Cir. 1986). Eastep-MCI clearly teaches a method for providing telecommunications

services (e.g., abstract, col., 2, line 26 – col., 3, line 38). Eastep-MCI also teaches instantiating a

feature object embodying the compiled representation (e.g., col., 11, lines 3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1

– 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61). Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept of generating a

compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col., 5, lines 8 –

62). Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of execution of operation in the compiled

representation of the mark-up language description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18 – col., 6, line

38). The combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius and Giordano-Cisco provide the

execution to perform the operation mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up

language. The operation specified by the compiled representation of the mark-up language help

carry out a task using the software for the device. Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19,

clearly states, "those skilled in the art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is

merely and example of the invention and that modifications can be made thereto without

departing from the scope of the invention. By way of non-limiting example, it will be

appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML and so forth, as described above, may be

utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further example, it will be appreciated that the

methods and systems may be implemented with programming structures other than OOP

objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon

the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is

maintained.

Applicant argues (11), "the cited art Smith-Julius does not disclose claimed limitations

of the claimed invention, including a method for providing telecommunications services". The

examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The claimed limitations of

the claimed invention, including a method for providing telecommunications services, are

rejected by combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius and Giordano-Cisco. In response

to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091,

231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Eastep-MCI clearly teaches a method for providing

telecommunications services (e.g., abstract, col., 2, line 26 – col., 3, line 38). Eastep-MCI also

teaches instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation (e.g., col., 11, lines

3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61). Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept

of generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col.,

5, lines 8 – 62). Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of execution of operation in

the compiled representation of the mark-up language description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18

– col., 6, line 38). The combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius and Giordano-Cisco

provide the execution to perform the operation mentioned in the compiled representation of the

mark-up language. The operation specified by the compiled representation of the mark-up

language help carry out a task using the software for the device. Also, the specification, page 92,

lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled in the art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated

embodiment is merely and example of the invention and that modifications can be made thereto

without departing from the scope of the invention. By way of non-limiting example, it will be

appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML and so forth, as described above, may be

utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further example, it will be appreciated that the

methods and systems may be implemented with programming structures other than OOP

objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon

the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is

maintained.

Applicant argues (12), "the cited art Giordano-Cisco does not disclose claimed

limitations of the claimed invention, including a method for providing telecommunications

services". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The

claimed limitations of the claimed invention, including a method for providing

telecommunications services, are rejected by combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius

and Giordano-Cisco. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually,

one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are

based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA

1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Eastep-MCI clearly

teaches a method for providing telecommunications services (e.g., abstract, col., 2, line 26 – col.,

3, line 38). Eastep-MCI also teaches instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled

representation (e.g., col., 11, lines 3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61). Smith-Julius

discloses the well-known concept of generating a compiled representation of a textual

description in a mark-up language (e.g., col., 5, lines 8 – 62). Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-

known concept of execution of operation in the compiled representation of the mark-up language

description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18 – col., 6, line 38). The combined teachings of

Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius and Giordano-Cisco provide the execution to perform the operation

mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up language. The operation specified by

the compiled representation of the mark-up language help carry out a task using the software for

the device. Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled in the art

will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of the invention and

that modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the invention. By

way of non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML

and so forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further

example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may be implemented with

programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly

claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject

matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (13), "the cited art Cooper et al., Westinghouse Electric Corporation,

5,646,947 (Hereinafter Cooper-Westinghouse) do not disclose claimed limitations of the claimed

invention, including a method for providing telecommunications services". The examiner

respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The claimed limitations of the

claimed invention, including a method for providing telecommunications services, are rejected

by combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Cooper-

Westinghouse. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one

cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based

on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In

re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Eastep-MCI clearly teaches a

method for providing telecommunications services (e.g., abstract, col., 2, line 26 – col., 3, line

38). Eastep-MCI also teaches instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled

representation (e.g., col., 11, lines 3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61). Smith-Julius

discloses the well-known concept of generating a compiled representation of a textual

description in a mark-up language (e.g., col., 5, lines 8 – 62). Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-

known concept of execution of operation in the compiled representation of the mark-up language

description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18 – col., 6, line 38). Cooper-Westinghouse discloses

the well-known concept of a boundary event with respect to the telecommunications service or

feature (e.g., col., 3, lines 4 - 61). The combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius,

Giordano-Cisco and Cooper-Westinghouse provide the execution to perform the operation

mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up language. The operation specified by

the compiled representation of the mark-up language help carry out a task using the software for

the device. Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled in the art

will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of the invention and

that modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the invention. By

way of non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML

and so forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further

example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may be implemented with

programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly

claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject

matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (14), "the cited art Chiu et al., Nortel Networks, 6,597,689 (Hereinafter

Chiu-Nortel) do not disclose claimed limitations of the claimed invention, including a method for

providing telecommunications services". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to

applicant's arguments. The claimed limitations of the claimed invention, including a method for

providing telecommunications services, are rejected by combined teachings of Eastep-MCI,

Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Cooper-Westinghouse and Chiu-Nortel. In response to

applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091,

231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Eastep-MCI clearly teaches a method for providing

telecommunications services (e.g., abstract, col., 2, line 26 – col., 3, line 38). Eastep-MCI also

teaches instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation (e.g., col., 11, lines

3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61). Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept

of generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col.,

5, lines 8 – 62). Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of execution of operation in

the compiled representation of the mark-up language description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18

– col., 6, line 38). Cooper-Westinghouse discloses the well-known concept of a boundary event

with respect to the telecommunications service or feature (e.g., col., 3, lines 4 - 61). Chiu-Nortel

discloses the well-known concept of utilizing an event indicative of any of call origination or call

termination (e.g., col., 4, lines 6 - 46). The combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius,

Giordano-Cisco, Cooper-Westinghouse and Chiu-Nortel provide the execution to perform the

operation mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up language. The operation

specified by the compiled representation of the mark-up language help carry out a task using the

software for the device. Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled

in the art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of the

invention and that modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the

invention. By way of non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other

HTML, XML and so forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By

way of further example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may be

implemented with programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims

contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the

claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (15), "the cited art Ram et al., 5,991,389, Northern Telecom

(Hereinafter Ram-Northern) do not disclose claimed limitations of the claimed invention,

including a method for providing telecommunications services". The examiner respectfully

disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The claimed limitations of the claimed invention,

including a method for providing telecommunications services, are rejected by combined

teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Ram-Northern. In response to

applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091,

231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Eastep-MCI clearly teaches a method for providing

telecommunications services (e.g., abstract, col., 2, line 26 – col., 3, line 38). Eastep-MCI also

teaches instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation (e.g., col., 11, lines

3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61). Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept

of generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col.,

5, lines 8 – 62). Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of execution of operation in

the compiled representation of the mark-up language description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18

– col., 6, line 38). Ram-Northern discloses the well-known concept of passing notification of at

least selected events (e.g., col., 6, lines 12 - 58). The combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-

Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Ram-Northern provide the notification to know about the selected

events. The information of knowing about the selected events help software to process the call

for the device. Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled in the

art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of the invention

and that modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the invention. By

way of non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML

and so forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further

example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may be implemented with

programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly

claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject

matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (16), "the cited art LaPier et al., Cisco Technology, 6,333,931

(Hereinafter LaPier-Cisco) do not disclose claimed limitations of the claimed invention,

including a method for providing telecommunications services". The examiner respectfully

disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The claimed limitations of the claimed invention,

including a method for providing telecommunications services, are rejected by combined

teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco Ram-Northern and Cooper-

Westinghouse and LaPier-Cisco. In response to applicant's arguments against the references

individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Eastep-MCI clearly teaches a method for providing telecommunications services (e.g., abstract,

col., 2, line 26 – col., 3, line 38). Eastep-MCI also teaches instantiating a feature object

embodying the compiled representation (e.g., col., 11, lines 3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9,

lines 9 – 61). Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept of generating a compiled

representation of a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col., 5, lines 8 – 62).

Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of execution of operation in the compiled

representation of the mark-up language description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18 – col., 6, line

38). Ram-Northern discloses the well-known concept of passing notification of at least selected

events (e.g., col., 6, lines 12 - 58). The combined teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius,

Giordano-Cisco, Ram-Northern and Cooper-Westinghouse and LaPier-Cisco provide the

notification to know about the selected events. The information of knowing about the selected

events help software to process the call for the device. Also, the specification, page 92, lines 12-

19, clearly states, "those skilled in the art will, of course, appreciate the illustrated embodiment is

merely and example of the invention and that modifications can be made thereto without

departing from the scope of the invention. By way of non-limiting example, it will be

appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML and so forth, as described above, may be

utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further example, it will be appreciated that the

methods and systems may be implemented with programming structures other than OOP

objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon

the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is

maintained.

Applicant argues (17), "the cited art Gulliford et al., Phoenix Wireless Group, 5,995,831

(Hereinafter Gulliford-Phoenix) do not disclose claimed limitations of the claimed invention,

including a method for providing telecommunications services". The examiner respectfully

disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The claimed limitations of the claimed invention,

including a method for providing telecommunications services, are rejected by combined

teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Gulliford-Phoenix. In response to

applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091,

231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Eastep-MCI clearly teaches a method for providing

telecommunications services (e.g., abstract, col., 2, line 26 – col., 3, line 38). Eastep-MCI also

teaches instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation (e.g., col., 11, lines

3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61). Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept

of generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col.,

5, lines 8 – 62). Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of execution of operation in

the compiled representation of the mark-up language description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18

– col., 6, line 38). Gulliford-Phoenix discloses the well-known concept of the event is a call

progress event and maintaining information regarding the present state of an on-going

telecommunications service (e.g., col., 5, lines 2 - 58). The combined teachings of Eastep-MCI,

Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Gulliford-Phoenix provide the call progress event to know the

progress of the call. Maintaining the information of the progress of the call for the on-going

telecommunications service help software to process the call for the device. Also, the

specification, page 92, lines 12-19, clearly states, "those skilled in the art will, of course,

appreciate the illustrated embodiment is merely and example of the invention and that

modifications can be made thereto without departing from the scope of the invention. By way of

non-limiting example, it will be appreciated that markup languages other HTML, XML and so

forth, as described above, may be utilized in practice of the invention. By way of further

example, it will be appreciated that the methods and systems may be implemented with

programming structures other than OOP objects". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly

claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject

matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Priority

3.   Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

However, the claimed limitations, for example, generating a compiled representation,

instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation, instantiating a context

object in response to an event, the context object signaling the feature object, effect execution of

the call service, call feature module instantiates a feature context object that accesses the

compiled representation to determine an action to be effected for providing the call service, etc.,

are not disclosed in the provisional applications; hence, applicant does not benefit the effective

date as the provisional priority date (Note: this rejection is maintained from the previous office

action, dated 10/20/2005, as applicant has not provided the teachings of the above mentioned

limitations in the priority document. The examiner has not applied prior arts that are available

for the rejection dated between the claimed priority date and the effective date of this

application).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine
grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or
improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible
harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.
Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686
F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA
1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to
overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground
provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this
application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).
Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal
disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37
CFR 3.73(b).

4.   Claims 1-11, 24-28, 32-38 and 40 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created

doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of

copending Application No.09/823,938. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they

are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed method / telecommunication

system for providing telecommunication services is similar to a telecommunications system

having processing module, external communication device, message handling object, dispatcher,

processes, etc., to handle telecommunication services. The claims 1-26 of copending

Application No.09/823,938 do not specifically mention about generating a compiled

representation. However, Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept of generating a

compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col., 5, lines 8 – 62,

also see other arts used for the rejections in this office action). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to facilitate generating a

compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language because the mark-up

language compiled representation would help provide the contents of the textual description to

the software. The software would help forward the contents of the textual description to the

device.

      This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting

claims have not in fact been patented. (Note: this rejection is maintained from the previous office

action, dated 10/20/2005).

Information Disclosure Statement

5.   An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, paper dated 11/14/2005 (note:

submitted after previous office action, 10/20/2005) is attached to the instant Office action. The

applicant did not provide date, month and year of several provided references of the IDS that are

very relevant to the claimed invention. The applicant is requested provide the earlier versions of

these cited references with the date, month and year.

Specification

6.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities (Note: due to the

newly submitted additional figures 59-91, dated 1/20/2006):

        a) The specification fails to provide support in the "Brief Description of the Drawings"

section for the newly submitted figures 59 – 61.

        b) The specification fails to provide support (in the "Detailed Description of the

Illustrated Embodiment" section) for each of the steps of the figures 59-61 (for example, the

specification also does not contain reference numbers along with disclosure for each of the steps

of the figures 59-61).

        Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

7.   New corrected drawings are required in this application because newly submitted figures

59-61 that show, "generating a compiled representation, instantiating a feature object embodying

the compiled representation, instantiating a context object in response to an event, the context

object signaling the feature object, effect execution of the call service, call feature module

instantiates a feature context object that accesses the compiled representation to determine an

action to be effected for providing the call service, etc." (note: figures 59-61 overcomes the

rejection of previous office action, dated, 10/20/2005)", but fails to provide labeling (block

number) of each of the steps with unique reference numbers to differentiate among the steps.

Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the

Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. A proposed

drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid

abandonment of the application. The amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of

the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being

amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header

(as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner

does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required

corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in

abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing

to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitations, "said signalling". There is insufficient antecedent basis

for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d). Note: claim does not contain

"signalling" step to support following step "responding" that needs to be performed. Further, the

claimed invention of claim 1 do not necessary support that the event must occur.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 1, 24, 25, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Eastep et al. 6,731,625, MCI (Hereinafter Eastep-MCI) in view of Smith II, Julius, 6772,139

(Hereinafter Smith-Julius), Giordano, III et al, Cisco Technology, 6,370,141 (Hereinafter

Giordano-Cisco) and Bowman-Amuah, 2003/0058277 (Hereinafter Bowman).

11.   As per claims 1 and 24, Eastep-MCI clearly teaches a method for providing

telecommunications services (e.g., abstract, col., 2, line 26 – col., 3, line 38, col., 10, lines 19 -

34), the method comprising the steps of:

mark-up language of operations for performing a call feature or service and instructions

describing a call / telecommunications service (e.g., col., 3, lines 4 – 64, e.g., col., 7, lines 8 – 62,

col., 19, lines 42 - 65),

instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation (e.g., col., 11, lines

3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61),

a context object in response to an event that maintains information regarding a present

state of the telecommunication (e.g., col., 9, lines 9 – 61, col., 31, lines 11 – 58, col., 21, lines 11

– 34, col., 41, lines 31 – 48) / call feature or service and that signals (e.g., col., 9, lines 9 – 61,

col., 31, lines 11 – 58, col., 21, lines 11 – 34, col., 41, lines 31 – 48) / the context object

signalling the feature object in regard to events occurring with respect to the call (e.g., col., 9,

lines 9 – 61, col., 31, lines 11 – 58, col., 21, lines 11 – 34, col., 41, lines 31 – 48) /

telecommunicaiton feature or service (e.g., col., 9, lines 9 – 61, col., 31, lines 11 – 58, col., 21,

lines 11 – 34, col., 41, lines 31 – 48),

the feature object responding to said signaling by effecting execution of one or more of

the operations to access the compiled representation of the textual description in the mark-up

language and to effect execution of the call (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61, col.,

41, lines 31 – 48, col., 21, lines 28 - 48) / telecommunication service defined by the logic

instructions (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61, col., 41, lines 31 – 48, col., 21, lines

28 - 48).

However, Eastep-MCI does not specifically mention about parsing and generating a

compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language and providing a textual

description in a mark-up language of a set of logic instructions.

Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept of generating a compiled representation of

a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col., 5, lines 8 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI with the teachings of Smith-Julius in order to

facilitate generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language

because the mark-up language compiled representation would help provide the contents of the

textual description to the software. The software would help forward the contents of the textual

description to the device.

However, Eastep-MCI and Smith-Julius do not specifically mention about execution of

operation in the compiled representation of the mark-up language description.

Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of execution of operation in the

compiled representation of the mark-up language description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18 –

col., 6, line 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI and Smith-Julius with the teachings of

Giordano-Cisco in order to facilitate execution of operation in the compiled representation of the

mark-up language description because the execution would help perform the operation

mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up language. The operation specified by

the compiled representation of the mark-up language would help carry out a task using the

software for the device.

Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius and Giordano-Cisco do not specifically mention about

instantiating a context object.

Bowman discloses the well-known concept of instantiating a context object (e.g.,

paragraphs, 894, 243, 2790, 3128, 3342, 3800, 4595, 4593, 4602, 4490, 4582, 2790, 2005).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius and Giordano-Cisco with the

teachings of Bowman in order to facilitate instantiating a context object because the instantiation

would provide information relating to the context object. This would help the execution to help

perform the operation mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up language. The

operation specified by the compiled representation of the mark-up language would help carry out

a task using the software for the device.

12.   As per claim 25, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman disclose the

claimed limitations as rejected above. Eastep-MCI also teaches the call /telecommunication

service is any of a call, a call feature, and subscriber or feature administration (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 58).

13.   As per claim 28, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Eastep-MCI also teaches the mark-up language is any of HTML, XML or any extension thereof (e.g., col., 7, lines 8 – 62).

14.   Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman in view of Cooper et al., Westinghouse Electric Corporation, 5,646,947 (Hereinafter Cooper-Westinghouse).

15.   As per claim 2, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman teach the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman do not specifically mention about a boundary event with respect to the call / telecommunications service or feature.

Cooper-Westinghouse discloses the well-known concept of a boundary event with respect to the call / telecommunications service or feature (e.g., col., 3, lines 4 - 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman with the teachings of Cooper-Westinghouse in order to facilitate utilizing a boundary event because the boundary event would help know how to process the call. The information of knowing how to process the call would help software to process the call for the device.

16.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep-MCI,

Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman and Cooper-Westinghouse in view of Chiu et al.,

Nortel Networks, 6,597,689 (Hereinafter Chiu-Nortel).

17.   As per claim 3, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman and Cooper-

Westinghouse teach the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Eastep-MCI, Smith-

Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman and Cooper-Westinghouse do not specifically mention about

utilizing an event indicative of any of call origination or call termination.

        Chiu-Nortel discloses the well-known concept of utilizing an event indicative of any of

call origination or call termination (e.g., col., 4, lines 6 - 46).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman and

Cooper-Westinghouse with the teachings of Chiu-Nortel in order to facilitate utilizing an event

indicative of any of call origination or call termination because the call origination/termination

event would help know when the call originated/terminated. The information of knowing when

the call originated/terminated   would help software to process the call for the device.

18.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep-MCI,

Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman in view of Ram et al., 5,991,389, Northern Telecom

(Hereinafter Ram-Northern).

19.   As per claim 4, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman teach the

claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and

Bowman do not specifically mention about passing notification of at least selected events.

Ram-Northern discloses the well-known concept of passing notification of at least

selected events (e.g., col., 6, lines 12 - 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman

with the teachings of Ram-Northern in order to facilitate passing notification of at least selected

events because the notification would help know about the selected events. The information of

knowing about the selected events would help software to process the call for the device.

20.   Claims 5, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep-

MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman and Ram-Northern in view of Cooper-

Westinghouse.

21.   As per claims 5, 6 and 7, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman and Ram-

Northern teach the claimed limitations as rejected above. Eastep-MCI also teaches effecting

execution via the feature object (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 58). However, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius,

Giordano-Cisco, Bowman and Ram-Northern do not specifically mention about execution of

further operations with respect to the call feature or service and identifying as a boundary event

an event notification of which does not result in effecting of execution of further operations.

Cooper-Westinghouse discloses the well-known concept of execution of further

operations and identifying as a boundary event an event notification of which does not result in

effecting of execution of further operations with respect to the call feature or service (e.g., col., 3,

lines 4 - 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman and Ram-Northern with the teachings of Cooper-Westinghouse in order to facilitate effecting of execution of further operations and identifying an boundary event/event notification which does not result in effecting of execution of further operations because effecting execution of future operations would help retain the effect of processing the call in future calls. Handling the boundary event/event notification independent of the future calls execution would help handle the call to be processed regardless of how the future calls will be handled. The information of knowing about the boundary event/event notification would help software to process the call for the device.

22. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman, Ram-Northern and Cooper-Westinghouse in view of LaPier et al., Cisco Technology, 6,333,931 (Hereinafter LaPier-Cisco).

23. As per claims 8 and 9, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman, Ram-Northern and Cooper-Westinghouse teach the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman, Ram-Northern and Cooper-Westinghouse do not specifically mention about a set of rules and actions for providing the call telecommunication service and defining a call policy associated with a subscriber.

LaPier-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of a set of rules and actions / a call policy

associated with a subscriber for providing the call/ telecommunication service (e.g., col., 5, lines

2 - 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco, Bowman,

Ram-Northern and Cooper-Westinghouse with the teachings of LaPier-Cisco in order to

facilitate a set of rules and actions / a call policy associated with a subscriber for providing the

telecommunication service because the call policy would help provide information on how the

call in handled. Handling the call using the information of the call policy would help software to

process the call for the device.

24.   Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep-

MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman in view of in view of Truchon et al., Nortel

Networks, 6,144,723 (Hereinafter Truchon-Nortel).

25.   As per claims 10 and 11, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman teach

the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco

and Bowman do not specifically mention about a call control event indicative of a signal

received from a telecommunications switch.

Truchon-Nortel discloses the well-known concept of a call control event indicative of a

signal received from a telecommunications switch (e.g., col., 4, lines 2 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman with the teachings of Truchon-Nortel in order to facilitate a call control event indicative of a signal received from a telecommunications switch because the event would provide information of the signal provided by the telecommunications switch. Handling the call using the information of the signal would help software to process the call for the device.

26.   Claims 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman in view of Gulliford et al., Phoenix Wireless Group, 5,995,831 (Hereinafter Gulliford-Phoenix).

27.   As per claims 26, 27, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman teach the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman do not specifically mention about the event is a call progress event and maintaining information regarding the present state of an on-going telecommunications service.

Gulliford-Phoenix discloses the well-known concept of the event is a call progress event and maintaining information regarding the present state of an on-going telecommunications service (e.g., col., 5, lines 2 - 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman with the teachings of Gulliford-Phoenix in order to facilitate the event being a call progress event because the call progress event would help know the progress of the call. Maintaining the

information of the progress of the call for the on-going telecommunications service would help

software to process the call for the device.

28.   Claims 32, 37, 38, 40, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dodrill et al. 6,490,564 (Hereinafter Dodrill) in view of Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-

Cisco and Bowman.

29.   As per claims 32, 37, 38, Dodrill teaches the following:

a telecommunications system (e.g., col. 7, line 8 – col. 9, line 65), comprising:

generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language of

operations for performing; any of a call feature or service (e.g., col. 7, line 8 – col. 9, line 65),

responding to an event indicative of a boundary of a telecommunications service or

feature for instantiating an object to effect execution of that service or feature (e.g., col. 9, line 1

– col. 13, line 19),

accessing, with the context object, handler logic operations embodied in the compiled

representation, the handler logic operations controlling any of the accessing, processing and

execution of further instructions necessary to effect execution of the service or feature (e.g., col.

9, line 1, col. 13, line 19),

accessing, with the context object and in accord with the handler logic operations, feature

logic operations embodied in the compiled representation, the feature logic operations executing

additional features or services (e.g., col. 9, line 1, col. 13, line 19),

resolving at run-time a type of at least one selected method required for effecting the

execution of an feature logic operation referenced by the compiled representation (e.g., abstract),

a call control module that controls a call processing context associated with a subscriber,

and a call feature module in communication with the call control module, the feature control

module accessing a compiled representation of textual description in a mark-up language of logic

defining a call / telecommunication service provided to a subscriber in response to an event to

effect execution of the service (e.g., abstract, col. 3, line 8 – col. 6, line 33),

However, Dodrill does not specifically mention about instantiated object that accessing

the compiled representation to determine at least an action to be effected for providing the call

service.

Eastep-MCI teaches the well-known concept of instantiated object that accessing the

compiled representation (e.g., col., 11, lines 3 – 65, col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61) to

determine at least an action to be effected for providing the call service (e.g., col., 3, lines 4 – 64,

col., 6, lines 1 – 58, col., 9, lines 9 – 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Dodrill with the teachings of Eastep-MCI in order to

facilitate usage of instantiated object that accessing the compiled representation to determine at

least an action to be effected for providing the call service because the compiled representation

would provide information that would help decide which action would be affected. The action

would help support the call service.

However, Dodrill and Eastep-MCI does not specifically mention about parsing and

generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language.

Smith-Julius discloses the well-known concept of generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language (e.g., col., 5, lines 8 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dodrill and Eastep-MCI with the teachings of Smith-Julius in order to facilitate generating a compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language because the mark-up language compiled representation would help provide the contents of the textual description to the software. The software would help forward the contents of the textual description to the device.

However, Dodrill, Eastep-MCI and Smith-Julius do not specifically mention about execution of operation in the compiled representation of the mark-up language description.

Giordano-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of execution of operation in the compiled representation of the mark-up language description (e.g., figures 2-4, col., 5, line 18 – col., 6, line 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dodrill, Eastep-MCI and Smith-Julius with the teachings of Giordano-Cisco in order to facilitate execution of operation in the compiled representation of the mark-up language description because the execution would help perform the operation mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up language. The operation specified by the compiled representation of the mark-up language would help carry out a task using the software for the device.

Dodrill, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius and Giordano-Cisco do not specifically mention about instantiating a feature context object.

Bowman discloses the well-known concept of instantiating a feature context object (e.g.,

paragraphs, 894, 243, 2790, 3128, 3342, 3800, 4595, 4593, 4602, 4490, 4582, 2790, 2005).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Dodrill, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius and Giordano-Cisco

with the teachings of Bowman in order to facilitate instantiating a context object because the

instantiation would provide information relating to the context object. This would help the

execution to help perform the operation mentioned in the compiled representation of the mark-up

language. The operation specified by the compiled representation of the mark-up language

would help carry out a task using the software for the device.

30.   As per claims 40, Dodrill, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman

disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dodrill also teaches the following:

the textual description defines a set of rules and actions for providing the

telecommunication service, the markup language is any of HTML, the logic textual description

defines a call policy associated with a subscriber, XML or any extension thereof, (e.g., col. 9,

line 1 - col. 10, line 63),

the compiled representation is implemented in a C++ environment, utilizing virtual

functions to facilitate such resolution, (e.g., col. 1, line 20 - col. 3, line 52),

the telecommunication service is any of a call, a call feature, and subscriber or feature

administration (e.g., col. 7, line 8 – col. 8, line 33).

31.   Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodrill,

Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman in view of Danne et. al. 6,226,286

(Hereafter Danne).

Dodrill, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and Bowman do not specifically

show that the telephone call instantiates the object, which accesses the HTML information to

process the telephone call.

However, Danne teaches the following:

instantiating the context object in response to a boundary event with respect to the

telecommunications service or feature, instantiating the context object in response to an event

indicative of any of call origination or call termination, passing notification of at least selected

events to the context object, by effecting execution of further operations with respect to the call

feature or service, an event notification of which does not result in the effecting of execution of

further operations with respect to the call feature or service by the context object, instantiating

the context object in response to a boundary event with respect to the telecommunications

service or feature, passing notification of at least selected events to the context object, the textual

description defines a set of rules and actions for providing the telecommunication service, the

textual description defines a call policy associated with a subscriber, the event includes a call

control event indicative of a signal received from the telecommunications switch, the feature

context object maintains information regarding present state of an on- going telecommunications

service, the event is a call progress event occurring with respect to the telecommunication

service, a telecommunications switch generates the event is a call progress event provided by the

call control module in response to a signal received with respect to status of an active telephone

call (e.g., FIG. 6 shows the procedure when a call is made. In the first block 1 the A subscriber

requests the B subscriber to be called, from his computer PC, in any of the above described

ways. FIG. 5 shows the signalling sequence when a call is made. The request to call the B

subscriber is transferred from the computer PC to the web server WS, which forwards the request

to the personal assistant PA, which is also shown in step 2 in FIG. 6, col., 6, line 15 – col. 7, line

29, The present invention relates to a service node between Internet networks and a

telecommunications network, said node being used to order telephony services by means of

HTML pages from a computer having a WWW browser. The invention also relates to a method

for calling a B subscriber, in which the Call is ordered from the computer but the connection is

set up between the telephones of the A and B subscribers' telephones. The service node

communicates with computers connected to computer networks using the HTTP protocol. The

node stores data related to a subscriber; said data can be used when the user requests a telephony

service. The node is centrally located, which enables the use of its services even if the user

moves to another location and terminal, abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Dodrill, Eastep-MCI, Smith-Julius, Giordano-Cisco and

Bowman with the teachings of Danne in order to facilitate usage of the boundary event because

the boundary event would help the telecommunications to process telephone call processing

using the markup language.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or

sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the

convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings

of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages

and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by

the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to

8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

March 28, 2006

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100